Some important connections and important influences:
Irving Babbitt; Charles Maurras; Jacques Maritain;
T.E. Hulme; Ezra Pound and Karl Mannheim.

There are some persons i.e. Professor Irving Babbitt, Ezra Pound, Charles Maurras, Jacques Maritain, T.E. Hulme and Karl Mannheim who contributed something positive to the making of T.S. Eliot's Social thought. Most of these authors accepted an authoritarian social order as the cure of social anarchy and had deep faith in an hierarchical setup which opposes liberalism as an enemy of traditional social order and stability. T.S. Eliot's yearning for social order and discipline and his belief in a 'monarchical' political creed are characterised by his association with and affiliation to these writers. The present chapter will examine some of the influences on Eliot by these authors.

The French Revolution brought about many changes in the history of human civilization. Right from the begin-
The beginning of the French Revolution, conservatives, like Burke, have been trying to challenge the Principles of liberalism in England. The distrust of intelligence was written large over the philosophy of the nineteenth century. Even Rousseau, the prophet of the French Revolution, was championing this trend. According to him, intelligence is dangerous because it undermines reverence: science is destructive because it takes away faith; reason is bad because it sets prudence against moral intuition. Without faith and moral intuition there is neither character nor society. The influence of these ideas was of great importance on the English writers. The two worlds during the first half of this century brought about many changes in England and almost changed the whole world, and the resultant impact was of paramount importance on T.S. Eliot, whose writings bear a curious combination of the mediævalists ranging from Dante to John of France to Andrewes; and the moderns ranging from Rousseau to Irving Babbitt. The influence of Dante, Irving Babbitt, Jacques Maritain and
Charles Maurras etc. on the writings of Eliot is distinct. It may be noted that Eliot, the poet, is inseparable from Eliot, the dramatist as well as the critic. A continuity and coherence of ideas is always present in his writings.

E.S. Eliot speaks of influences of different people with whom he came into contact either through writings or personally in his essay, "To Criticize the Critic." During the formative years he was influenced in his social, religious, political and moral criticism by different persons. The influence of Bobbitt (with an infusion later of J.F. Hakluyt and of the more literary essays of Charles Maurras) is apparent in my recurring theme of classicism versus Romanticism.

It goes without saying that Eliot is a Classicist and his love for classicism remained unchanged throughout his literary career and this cannot be attributed to a single influence. Eliot himself divides his career into three periods: during his formative first period he was
writing for the 'Egoist' a remarkable bi-weekly edito and published by Miss Barret Teaver and here was published his most influential and representative essay, 'Tradition and the Individual Talent' (1916) during this period he was under the influence of Ezra Pound and professor Irving Babbitt who introduced Eliot to the Philosophy of humanist at the University of Harvard; and Babbitt's traditionalist doctrines were re-inforced a little later by the ideas of T.S. Eliot and Charles Maurras.

T.S. Eliot had been at Harvard from 1906 to 1914 and it was the Golden Era of Harvard. Many outstanding professors like George Santayana, Royce, Babbitt and Kittredge and other great teachers and intellectuals were training their students to their own versatility, and to T.S. Eliot the University supplied a reservoir of ideas which he has been receiving for fifty years. In "The Masters of Modern French Criticism" Babbitt analysed the decay of standard and the rise of relativism and the
anarchy in literature and art that is consequent upon decline in standards. His "Literature and the American College" had distinguished between humanist and humanitarian ideas. Again in 'Rousseau and Romanticism' he had said that the imagination holds the balance of power between the higher and the lower nature of man and that Rousseau's idyllic imagination corrupted the aspirations of modern man. "Democracy and Leadership" is the most penetrating work on politics by Babbitt; and it is not precisely a political treatise but a work of moral philosophy.

Babbitt writes, "when studied with any degree of thoroughness the economic problem will be found to run into the political problem, the political problem into the philosophical problem and the philosophical problem itself to be almost indissolubly bound up with the religious problem."
And undoubtedly T.S. Eliot was looking at the social and political problems confronting his mind from this religious stand-point. Though it is difficult to say what degree of influence of Babbitt had on T.S. Eliot; it will be very interesting to examine Babbitt's influence on Eliot.

Tradition, Eliot thinks is inseparable from Classicism and his idea of classicism is largely the heritage of European thought - the literature of Greece, France and Rome. His love for classicism and tradition seems to be generated by Irving Babbitt who had been among Eliot's masters at Harvard and exploded the Romantic idea of the world.

In place of the prevailing values of the time Babbitt offered the values of certain notions at certain moments the most propitious in their history, and doctrines by which a writer may assimilate and communicate them. Eliot, coming to him in his receptive years
hoard at his table and read in his books the doctrine of Classicism and the complimentary doctrine of tradition. "

Babbitt's influence was also felt by W. R. Anand while conversing with Eliot. "you could read the Buddha Sayings to greater profit, he (Eliot) whispered with a brief smile."

According to Anand, "this confirmed my feelings that Eliot had been influenced by professor Irving Babbitt into awareness of Gautam's idea of the transitoriness of life, of the pain of existence and despair at the fate of man. Perhaps somewhere in New England he had begun to be hostile to his own milieu and had become alienated. This is probably why he had become expatriate. He may have seen the futility of General Motors gentry being communicants in the Catholic Church."

It has been said already that his teacher Babbitt influenced him intensely and Eliot himself says
of his affectionate allegiance to him: "Having myself
begun as a disciple of Mr. Babbitt, I feel that I have
rejected nothing that seems to me positive in his
teaching." "Babbitt is a stout upholder of tradition and
continuity." 7 and so is also T.S. Eliot. Professor Babbitt,
as an exponent of the conservative tradition, believes in
an hierarchical order of society. According to Babbitt "it
is in fact the quality of a man's work that should determine
his place in the hierarchy that every civilised society
requires." 'work' Babbitt thinks implies 'self-reform' which
inevitably brings us to the nature of justice. In a society,
according to him there are divisions of 'work' : people who
with their minds rank above those who work with hands. And
persons with higher ethical standard are the social leaders
who help preserve a standard in absence of which our society
suffers. He believes that the loss of true leaderships is
both cause and effect of our deficiency in standard. "One
should, therefore, in the interest of democracy itself seek
to substitute the doctrine of the rights of man for the
document of the rights of man." But as far as the idea
of democracy is concerned, Hobbit wishes that quality of
man rather than quantity of men, as in modern democracy
today should be valued. Because professor Hobbit thinks
that struggle between good and evil is not in society;
it is in the individual and therefore the individuals;
the leaders in particular, must ascertain some ethical
situations in them because the ethical sanctions must come
from 'will' and 'conscience' of the individuals.

Hobbit's concept of leaders with superior
intellect and higher will prefigures Eliot's concept of
elite with the difference that while the later implies
outer authority or religion on the elite, the former
reflects outer reasoning on them. Because Hobbit's
concept of humanism implies that personality is the
source of good and life is the measure of value.
Babbitt expresses his political ideas in the light of these ethical values of work and higher nature of man.

Though Babbitt's weakness, as Eliot says, is his failure to recognize the connection of humanism with religion, his theory of self control for qualitative improvement of individuals and society move in the same political direction as Eliot's conception of society.

As far as the philosophy of humanism is concerned there is a marked difference between the two and the core of difference essentially is the issue of religion. As a supporter of 'humanism' Eliot thinks that professor Babbitt tried to ignore the role of religion in the formation of his idea of humanism; "With all the references that Mr. Babbitt makes to the role of religion in the past and all the connection that he perceives between the decline of theology and the growth of the modern errors that he detests, he reveals himself as uncompromisingly detached from any religious belief...." On the other hand Eliot's central
point is that at the heart of political, cultural or literary matters there is always the issue of religion.

After Eliot was baptised in 1927, Babbitt's reaction was only to ask his disciple to come out in the open and in response to that Eliot wrote the essay of 'Humanism of Irving Babbitt, (1928) in which Criticising Babbitt, with reference to his 'Democracy and Leadership' Eliot remarks:...

"It is quite irrelevant to conjecture the possible development of the European races without Christianity — to imagine that is, a tradition of humanism equivalent to the actual tradition of Christianity" and Eliot continues.

"It should lead I think, to the conclusion that the humanistic point of view is auxiliary to and dependent upon the religious point of view. For us religion is Christianity; and Christianity implies, I think, the conception of the Church. It would not only be interesting but invaluable if Prof. Babbitt, with his learning, his great ability, his influence and his interest in the most important questions of the time could reach this point."
It is true that Babbitt put excessive stress on the individual will and conscience and in spite of his intimate understanding of the religious aspect of European civilisation and its close affinity to European Society through the Christian Church, he did not seek to impose the outer authority of religion on the individuals. Because Babbitt thinks that human work should be controlled by the will and conscience of individual rather than religion or any other political authority. Because, in the introduction to "Democracy and Leadership" Babbitt declares: "I differ from the Christian, however, in that my interest in the higher will and the power of veto it exercises over man's expansive desires is humanistic rather than religious."

In favour of rejection of outer authority on the individual Babbitt says,"... I am with the naturalists, who have from the start been rejecting outer authority in favour of the immediate and experiential." For professor Babbitt thinks that his substitution of social reform for
self-reform is that it involves the turning away from the more immediate to the less immediate.

Both the writers are following divergent directions in respect of the authority of control over society and individuals; and at its basis of their arguments lies the authority of Christian religion, which as a naturalist Babbitt does not approve of. But both of them belong to the elitist camp. Another important person with whom T.S. Eliot have long acquaintance and friendship is Ezra Pound who held views about society some of which are similar to those held by T.S. Eliot.

Ezra Pound was born in 1885, in Hailey, Idaho, in the Middle West of the United States. He passed through Hamilton College and the state University of Pennsylvania, took a Master's degree there in Romance Languages; and thereafter in 1907, he was appointed lecturer in French and Spanish at Wabash College, Crawfordsville. His appointment
did not last long and he was dismissed for being "too
much of a Latin quarter type" and as G.S. Fraser informs
us in his Ezra Pound, (London, 1962) that "we can trace
to this episode Pound's lasting dislike and distrust of
the conventional academic mind and his belief that protec-
tant Christianity is, almost of necessity, the enemy of
happiness and Culture."  

Around 1908 Ezra Pound went to London. In 1910
he developed friendship with the poet-philosopher, T.E.
Hulme and around 1915 he came into contact with T.S.Eliot,
who by then was writing 'Prufrock' and 'Portrait of a Lady'
Before the outbreak of the great war Pound wrote 'Hugh
selwyn Mauberley' and 'Homage to Sextus Propertius' which
reflect Pound's disgust at the cheapening and commercialisa-
tion of culture. Other important works of Pound include
'Cantos', 'The ABC of Economics' (1933) 'Guide to Kulchur'
(1939) and 'Pisan Cantos' (1949) and poems and articles
scattered in different magazines.
Most of Pound's social and political ideas seem to be controversial and self-contradictory and rival camps of critics consider his political and economic ideas either as springing from deep-rooted fundamental insight or as reactions of an unbalanced mind.

The main theme of Ezra Pound's political and economic ideas, as revealed in the Cantos during the first period of his life seems to carry a sense of social responsibility which he thinks is absent in contemporary European Society.

He, therefore like T.S. Eliot stresses the need of an 'order' both in individual and society.

"If a man have not order within him / He cannot spread order about him; / And if a man have not order within him his family will not act with due order; / And if the Prince have order within him / He cannot put order in his
dominions. / And kung gave the words 'order' /
And 'brotherly difference' / And said nothing
of the 'life after death'"

(canto - 13)

Pound's search for an order was generated by
the contemporary social ills caused by the Great War along
with existing financial institutions in America or in Great
Britain. During the twenties he began to think that financial
inequity is a cancer in the body of civilisation and it is
at the root of all human decay. His association with A.W.
Douglas and his consequent support to 'social credit theory'
is of great importance in determining the course of his
political ideas.

Pound accepted some of the Principles of social
credit. "Social Credit offered such an astonishingly straight
forward explanation of so many of the world's ills,
including its propensity to make wars and to smash young
promise, that Pound was captivated by it. It supported
moreover, several of his own early assumptions in 'patri
Mia' and elsewhere: the limitless bounty of nature and the
alien forces standing ready to corrupt a nation's strength.
It also supported, in fact stands as a neglected monument
to, the idea that cultural maladies have specific and
concrete solutions." 15

Pound's 'A.B.C. of Economics' or 'The cantos'
and 'Patri-Mia' and other writings paint to that, firstly
there is plenty in nature but the poverty or scarcity is
caused by a paralysis of Commerce. Secondly, the financial
power or the power of society is centralised in a few
hands. Thirdly there is the beginning of domination of
power with the end of independent governments. And fourthly
there is huge exploitation of the defridden workers. Like
Ezra Pound, Eliot was also dissatisfied with the existing
economic situation and "he (Eliot) continued to sympathise
with the kind of radical thought which social credit repre-
sented. But by the time peace had returned to Europe Social
credit had become a thing of the past."  

As years went on Pound adopted a political position: He took the path of 'elitism' and his faith in totalitarian control of society became firm. Pound expressed his yearning for an hierarchical pattern of society.

Pound rejected the modern economic and social life. Instead he believed that "the science of economics will not get very far until it grants the existence of will as a component; i.e. will toward order, will toward justice or fairness, desire for civilisation."  

Pound was attracted by Mussolini primarily because "that great man is filled with a very different passion, the will toward order." And according to pound Mussolini had the new ways to envision society. "Pound seeks inditement and change. He condemns pandemic usury and advocates a society inspired by Jefferson, modulated by Confucian precepts, and heedful of the changes Mussolini had already brought into being in one country."
In aspiring for social changes Ezra Pound does not accept the revolutionary methods envisaged by Karl Marx. He does not approve of class struggle to exterminate class. Though he favours political actions his idea of political action is aesthetical. "His social crusades did not issue from any truly egalitarian sympathies for the common lot of mankind. Rather, they issued from a belief that if only the correct ministrations were applied, all would be well and society could be left in peace for evermore, the better for art to prosper, the better for unruly men to be taught the pleasures of art." (19A)

Most of the political and economic ideas of Ezra Pound particularly his yearning for a social order, emphasis on an authoritarian control of society and rejection of modern democratic politics or contemporary economic system are to be found in T.S. Eliot. But at the same time they also differ considerably. In the first place "Pound's preference for elite governance was not to be based wholly upon a disenchantment with the masses, but also on an
initial assumption, never made by Eliot, that the arts Carry society and that the best artists must ultimately be recognised as the most important social pioneers.”

But Eliot says that Mr. Pound is interested in public affairs primarily as an artist and Eliot is "inclined to approach public affairs from the point of view of a moralist." (196)

Secondly, and the most significant one is the issue of religion which Eliot upholds and Pound finds fault with Eliot for it. Both of them were reacting to the same problems but their solutions to the problems were different. Whereas T.S. Eliot prescribed Christianity as the remedy of contemporary anarchy, Ezra Pound discovered hope in Italian Fascism.

Eliot criticises Pound for the absence of religious sanction in his criticism. In the 'After strange Gods' (1934) Eliot writes "Mr. Pound presents the closest
counterpart of Irving Babbitt extremely quick-witted and very learned he is attracted to the Middle Ages, apparently by everything except that, which gives them their significance." (19) Eliot declares that Pound's insistence on tolerance, benevolence, inoffensiveness and increase of purchasing power is vaporous without a spiritual and moral sanction.

In 'Guide to Kulchar' Eliot's religion angers Pound. Before that also Pound reacted sharply to Eliot's criticism of Pound in the 'After Strange Gods! Pound observed, "Mr. Eliot's book is pernicious in that it distracts the reader from a vital problem (economic justice): it implies that we need more religion, but does not specify the nature of that religion; all the implications are such as to lead the readers' mind into a fog." (19)

Another important difference between the two is that Ezra Pound favoured political action and he held, as Fascism did, the 'priority of action over doctrine'. But
Eliot did the opposite. Pound participated in political activities. As a staunch supporter of Mussolini, broadcast from Radio Rome for which he was imprisoned by the U.S. government but Eliot did never participate in any political action and there is no proof of his support to Mussolini but some of the general accomplishments of an authoritarian government attracted him and he held his support for an authoritarian social order.

In spite of all these dissimilarities between the two writers they belong to the same camp of artists who mix political ideas with creative arts. And within the framework of a Capitalist society aspires for social progress and peace. Both of them rejected the deterministic approach to the contemporary cultural problems and believed in their artistic vision of society. At the bottom of all their social ideas, as has been discussed above, lies the fact that as far as the basic political ideas of both the writers are concerned, Ezra Pound contributed something to the
making of Eliot’s political and social ideas. It is only from Pound that Eliot learnt that arts carry social responsibility and a social order, authoritarian in their case, is necessary for nourishment of arts. Divergent in solutions but there is unity in their reaction to the problems.

Yet another important influence on T.S. Eliot was that of Charles Maurras who was a fierce critic of the nineteenth century and hated the industrial Plutocracy. Maurras was a political leader and he was also a man of letters. As a politician he advocated Nationalistic monar­chism in France. He founded a new paper called 'Action Française' which carried anti-republican and pro-monarchist propaganda in France. Soon the Action Française movement became organised in France and with an organised base of supporters advocated a return of hierarchical and non-republican ‘order’ even by means of violence.

Eliot read some of Maurras’ books and he translated Maurras "Prologue to an Essay on Criticism" in 1917.
published in 1905 a book called *L' Avenir de l' intelligence* which probably Eliot read in 1911. In this book Maurras argues with historical analysis that intelligence is a very important force in the nation.

Before the French Revolution, Maurras says, there was order in society because power was in the hands of the traditional authorities. Since then power had been increasing upon the people and the real power has been concentrated upon a few people who direct and create opinion. The intellectual life according to him was adulterated by materialism and the process was subject to foreign financial pressures. To put things right Maurras advocated a counterrevolution by the intellectuals.

Eliot did not pay much attention to this movement but he wanted order in society and accepted Monarchism as a political ideology.

Maurras was one of the spiritual guides of Eliot.
upto his adoption of Christianity in 1927. Though T.S. Eliot was not influenced by Maurras' Counter-Revolutionary movement, he was certainly influenced by Maurrassian sense of order and monarachism as a political philosophy. "... Monarchism which he (Eliot) affirmed most emphatically in the 'Preface to Lancelot Andrewes', was valued because it allows the social order to be surmounted by a spiritual order and authority derives from above rather than within the individual. Maurras' conception of hierarchy was attractive to both Eliot and Jacques Maritain, and it brought Eliot into an easy association with Catholicism."

Maurras' sense of order and stability in society had some impact on Eliot and in applying Maurrassian nationalist monarchism to Great Britain, Eliot thought of the indirect political theory of Maurras that speaks of principle of order in the national life: "If anything, in other generation or so, is to preserve us from a sentimental Anglo-Fascism, it will be some system of ideas which will
Like Charles Maurras, T.S. Eliot believed that only an authoritarian order can safeguard society from anarchy and chaos. And Eliot took his royalist position in politics in support of the traditional monarchical order of society. In defence of Action Francaise, Eliot writes: "The Action Française insists upon the importance of continuity by the kingship and hereditary class, upon something which has some analogy to what the government of England was formerly, at least supposed to be; it would protect the humble citizens against the ambitious politicians."

Eliot had a personal allegiance to Maurras and he dedicated his 'Dante' to him in 1922. In a literary luncheon organised by the London Conservative Union on April 19th, 1955 Eliot remarks: "I have sometimes thought that if Charles Maurras had confined himself to literature,
and to the literature of political theory and had never attempted to found a political party, a movement — engaging in and increasing the acrimony of the political struggle — if he had not given his support to the restoration of monarchy in such a way as to strengthen instead of reducing animosities — then those of his ideas which were sound and strong might have spread more widely and penetrated more deeply, and affected more sensibly to the contemporary mind." Maurras tried to achieve moral unity in France on the basis of monarchy but later he realised that Catholicism was a vital factor in French tradition and life, and therefore without Catholicism unity in France will not be possible. On the other hand Eliot thought, from the very beginning that the Christian religion was the guiding force of the social and cultural life in England.

A significant similarity between Eliot and Maurras is that both of them reacted against democracy. The royalists, in particular reacted against the democratic idea
of society, because they thought that important governmental decisions require a unity and vigour of which a democracy or a plutocracy is incapable and which only a powerful king or a dictator can supply. Jean Daumet, Charles Maurras and Jacques Bainville led the pro-monarchy movement against the parliamentary form of government in France during the first half of the century. They believed that authority should remain in the throne which can only safeguard the national interest. "Power, stability and the supremacy of national interest can be maintained only by monarchs; and the whole of inheritance and training of king creates in him a devotion to affairs of state and a disposition to perpetuate his country's tradition." Eliot's insistence on the enlightened section of people for guidance and rejection of mass-involvement correspond to Maurras' ideas. Later Maurras' Action Française was condemned as non-Christian and he developed a democratic variety of Catholic Social Philosophy but by
then Eliot became a staunch supporter of Catholicism. Eliot had deep personal affection for Maurras whose political philosophy i.e. the monarchical form of society, he advocated for England. Jacques Maritain also had some influence on the making of Eliot's religious philosophy. The Contribution of the Catholics to the intellectual life of France between the wars was great and it stemmed from the days of the religious revival. Many French intellectuals reviewed their studies of St. Thomas Aquinas during the revival. Jacques Maritain was the most noteworthy among the New-Thomists.

Jacques Maritain was a fervent Bergsonian until 1906 but after his scientific studies in Germany he was converted to Roman Catholicism by Leon Bloy. His philosophical works include (among others), *Introduction générale à la philosophie* (1922) *Docteur angélique* (1930) *De la philosophie Chrétienne* (1933) *Bramante de spirituel* (1927) and *L' Humanism integral* (1936)
Maritain in his philosophical works "aimed to show that faith is compatible with the modern world, and to show the values of Thomist thought as a framework for life today, not only from a religious point of view but also politically." 23(A)

Maritain rejected the anti-intellectual aspect of Bergson's Philosophy and realised that Bergson had released in him the sense of absolute. He propagated the idea of Christian democracy and with the second world war his political interests increased and he was appointed ambassador to Rome. "The Catholic polemist in Maritain was active, too, not only against Bergson, but against Descartes, Rousseau, Kant, Blochel and others." 23(B)

According to Maritain, the unity of civilization is based not on dogma but on civil tolerance. He abhorred totalitarianism, but anticipated a Christian democratic state in the future; he spoke of the need for radical
economic change, the nholitlou of the privileged moneyed class, reserved the right of the quest. According to Varltainy tolerance was of great importance, and with it he accorded an important place to consensus and democracy of popular consciousness, the function of the Church was conceived as inspirational one. Warltain thinks that the Church should not operate through formal structures but through a regent of Christian social formation to a humanistic-egalitarian that the movement work has passed progresszestably. According to him, "It is quite true since the dawn of the Christian Unity, in need of new humanism, move the most politically advanced and most devoted section intellectuals and groups, those who might compose such groups should not operate through formal structures but through inspirationnal means. Warltain thinks that the Church condition of the Church was conceived of an important place to consensus and democracy of popular tolerance was of great importance, and with it, he accorded economic change, the nholitlou of the privileged moneyed class, reserved the right of the quest. According to Varltainy tolerance was of great importance, and with it, he accorded an important place to consensus and democracy of popular consciousness, the function of the Church was conceived as inspirational one.
being' understood as the spiritual, divine, prime element as the highest reality. The Thomist speculative constructions result in recognising God as the prime cause of being and the prime foundation of philosophical categories. Likewise T.S. Eliot began to believe that authority should be outside the individual because of the flawed nature of man. This 'authority' should derive its sanction, according to Eliot, from religion and for him religion is Christianity. He opposed popular ideologies for social changes and was in search of an alternative to democracy and liberalism.

".. neither liberalism nor conservatism, which are not philosophies and may be merely habits, is enough to guide us."25

As reactions to the inadequacies of liberalism and democracy Eliot discovered his desired philosophical authority as the guiding force of society in Christian religion and Maritain's Neo-Thomism also prescribed this path of subjective and objective state of philosophy, —
"God as being itself of human reason, validated creator, and the incarnation of Jesus Christ; the divine grace that makes the state of Christian philosophy."

T.S. Eliot saw in the English Church the decency, dignity and the authority which might provide, he thought a proper corrective to the fadist modern mind.

As far as the problem of culture and civilisation is concerned Maritain thinks that there are two spheres i.e. the terrestrial and the perishable good of our life on this earth; and the subordination of all these to the eternal life as an intermediate end to the ultimate end. "And such subordination to a higher end gives it an intrinsic super­elevation in its own proper order: a Christian civilisation has higher standards, a more perfect earthly propriety than a pagan civilisation."

Eliot's social criticism, particularly his ideas on culture and social morality reflect some of Maritain's ideas. Maritain says, "Because this development is not
only material, but also and principally moral, it does without saying that the part played in it by the religious element is consequently a principal part. In truth, the religion which the concept of culture of civilization, in abstracto, of itself requires is only natural religion."??

T.S.Eliot does not believe in material efficiency and progress. He condemns Habbitt's humanism and declares that humanism is incomplete without religion. There are some other points of similarity between their thought. For example T.S.Eliot ridicules the concepts of liberty, equality, and democracy etc. Britain also ignored these tendencies and considered that the modern crisis is "transient" because of these tendencies. He says, "Modern man believed in liberty without the mastery of self or moral responsibility, for free will was incompatible with scientific determination; and his belief in equality without justice, too, was a metaphysical idea that lost any rational foundation and lacked any criterion in our modern biological and sociological outlook."??
About democracy he writes: "And modern man looked for democracy — without any heroic task of justice to be performed and without brotherly love from which to get inspiration. The most significant political movement of modern times, the concept of and devotion to, the rights of the human person and the rights of the people, was thus warped by the same loss of the concept and the sense of purpose or finality, and by the repudiation of the evangelical ferment acting in human history; democracy tended to become an embodiment of the sovereign will of the people in the machinery of a bureaucratic state more and more irresponsible and more and more asleep."

As shown above, Maritain's concept of humanism bears some resemblance to Eliot's. Maritain wants to see 'theocentric humanism' which is unlike the 'anthropocentric humanism' detached from God. The modern humanism seeks a rehabilitation of man in a separation from God. Maritain
maintains, "After the great disillusionment of anthropocentric humanism and the atrocious experience of anti-humanism of our day, what the world needs is a new humanism, a theocentric or integral humanism which would consider man in all his natural grandeur and weakness, in the entirety of his wounds being inhabited by God, in the full reality of nature, sin and sainthood. Such a humanism would recognise all that is irrational in man, in order to tame it to reason and all that is supranatural, in order to have reason vivified by it and to open man to the descent of the divine into him. Its main work would be to cause the Gospel leaven and inspirational to penetrate the secular structures of life—a work of sanctification of the temporal order."

Both of them stress the primacy of religion in the ideas of humanism. Both Maritain and T.S.Eliot think that democratic form of society is disastrous and irresponsible: "There is a fallacy in democracy, for instance in assuming that a majority of natural and unregenerate is likely to want the right things; there may also be a fallacy
in dictatorship in so far as it represents a willingness of a majority to surrender responsibility.\textsuperscript{36}

Both of them also detested "Reason" which is the foundation of liberal democratic ideas. Eliot considered "Reason to be a 'deceitful goddess' while Jacques Maritain thought that "Human Reason lost its grasp of Being, and became available only for the mathematical reading of sensory phenomena and for the building up of corresponding material technique — a field in which any absolute reality, any absolute truth and any absolute value is of course forbidden."\textsuperscript{37}

T.S. Eliot's 'The Idea of a Christian Society' is very close to Maritain's thought: "the restoration of order will be wholly Christian or an utter failure."

Eliot's religious social code of behaviour and his conception of natural end of man and virtue and wellbeing in society correspond to Maritain's ideas of a Christian democracy. Some important points of similarities between
Eliot and Maritain, are (1) Man is considered above and superior to political society. (2) Human history is made up of some periods, each of which is possessed of particular intelligible structure, and therefore a particular basic requirement. (3) Modern civilisation is a secular civilisation and it is primarily concerned with the temporal well-being of people and attainment of freedom and dignity in social and political life. There is one important difference between them. According to Maritain, Christian democracy, not the liberal democracy in the modern sense of the term is capable of moral realisation in matters of politics and therefore there is a need of Christian religious values. But Eliot repudiates democracy and desires a traditional hierarchical form of society i.e. an authoritarian society. Maritain and T.S.Eliot belong to the same school of catholic philosophers and therefore there is an interaction of thought between them. And certainly 'The Idea of a Christian Society' carries some of Maritain's Ideas of Christian democracy.
It is very difficult to speak of the influence of T.E. Hulme on the palimpsest T.S. Eliot's mind because his ideas on Classicism, Romanticism, Tradition and Religion are the products of his association with different persons like Bradley, Babbitt, Maurras and others. Sir Herbert Read in his "T.S.E. : A Memoir" says that Hulme's 'speculations' did not make any difference to Eliot's political idealism or philosophical faith but his convictions immensely strengthened Eliot's.

Herbert Read edited and published Hulme's 'speculations' in 1924 at the suggestion of A.R.Orange, editor of the Guild Socialist New Age. "Eliot considered that a literary classicism in harmony with such thinkers as Hulme, Maurras and Babbitt could provide a solid foundation for the Criterion."  

T.E. Hulme, who died at thirty four challenged the tradition at its roots and his main point is that the
humanist tradition, dominating Europe since the Renaissance was breaking up and the fundamental beliefs of humanism are false. He divides the history of civilisation of Europe from two aspects, (1) the Middle Ages extending from Augustine to Renaissance and the (2) Renaissance to now. And according to Hulme the "ideology of the first period is religious; of the second, humanist." 

The first period, he says had some belief in dogma which is the belief in the subordination of man to certain absolute values, the radical imperfection of man, the doctrine of original sin. The central point according to T.E. Hulme is that "the beliefs were the center of their whole civilisation, and that even the character of their economic life was regulated by them — in particular by the kind of ethics which springs from the acceptance of sin as a fact." 

The second period, he says is just the opposite of the first period. Like the first period the second period
also revolves round the same conception of the nature of man. But it considers man as fundamentally good and all philosophical, ethical and literary conceptions were based on this new image of man. This humanist tradition began to change the life of man. But Hulme thinks that the humanist tradition is breaking up because, humanism as one of the two aspects of Renaissance, the other being the Romanticism "which is bound inevitably later to develop into sentimental," utilitarian romanticism." 41 Romanticism, as Eliot says is finished with the French Revolution.

Like Eliot who condemns Babbit's humanism which, according to Eliot is bound to fail for the lack of a religious philosophy, T.F. Hulme also holds unhesitatingly" the religious conception of ultimate values to be right, the humanist wrong." 42

As far as Eliot's conception of Romanticism and Classicism is concerned T.F. Hulme's is very near to him.
There is marked similarity of thought between them with of course, a difference of approach: while Eliot's approach is literary, Hulme's is philosophical but both are running to reject Romanticism and accept Classicism.

Eliot's classicist or anti-romantic position was formed in the significant essay, "Tradition and the Individual Talent" but only in the preface of the collection of essays called, "For Lancelot Andrews" he declares publicly that he is a Classicist in literature and Anglo-Catholic in religion and royalist in politics. The extension of his classicist and religious position was further confirmed with the 'Idea of a Christian Society' and 'Notes Towards the Definition of Culture.'

Both Hulme and T.S. Eliot hated Reason and liberty, the guiding force of Romanticism which, according to them, after Rousseau, held that man the individual, is an infinite reservoir of possibilities; and if one can so rearrange
society by the destruction of the oppressive then these possibilities will have a chance and one will get 'progress.' T.S.Eliot in 'After Strange Gods' and Rulme in 'Speculations' held that "man is an extra-ordinarily fixed and limited animal whose nature is absolutely constant. It is only by tradition and organisation that anything descent can be got out of him."

Both of them believe in the organic evolution of society and reject the deterministic philosophy. Material obstacles and political ideals are negative in character. Both Rulme and Eliot believe in some higher religious institutions and the subordination of man to this authority: "... the way of thinking about the world and the man, the conception of sin, and the categories which ultimately make up the religious attitude, are true categories and the right way of thinking."

Inspite of Eliot's belief in the dogma of 'original Sin' or the imperfectibility of human nature,
he also believes that the forces of evil and sin can be subdued by religious discipline and divine grace.

M.R. Anand informs us in his "Conversations in Bloomsbury" that Eliot was aware of the forces of evil or sin: "The quest requires experience of good and evil. He (Eliot) paused and then continued: 'Unlike Kafka who said, 'evil is aware of good, but not good of evil', Jesus may have believed that the good must be aware of evil.'\(^45\)

This is why Eliot, like Hulme, stresses the primacy of the supernatural over the natural life.

Whether this correspondence of ideas between Eliot and Hulme is an influence of the latter on the former is less important because both of them are original in their approach, content and style. Paying tribute to T.E. Hulme, Eliot writes in the Commentary of the 'Criterion' "Hulme is classical, reactionary: he is antipodes of the eclectic, tolerant and democratic mind of the end of the last century."\(^46\)
According to Eliot, Hulme is a solitary figure and he bears close affinities with Charles Maurras, Sorel and Pierre Lassere. "Compared with these men Hulme is immature and unsubstantial" but he was a creative genius.

Raymond Williams calls him "the first antiromantic critic "whose conviction about man is that" man is by nature bad or limited and can consequently only accomplish anything of value by discipline, ethical, heroic or political. "Hulme echoes Burke frequently specially when he talks about the driving force of the French Revolution and his rejection of liberalism and Romanticism. Hulme says that romanticism is 'split religion' and in the same way culture. Eliot was highly influenced by Hulme's doctrine of Original Sin and ample reflections are found in his 'Notes Towards the Definition of culture' and "The Idea of a Christian Society." Where Eliot seems to "imply the acceptance of the doctrine of "Original Sin" as the heart of the Christian religion and in effect, more
significant than the redemptive power of Christ. For Christian Orthodoxy such emphasis is itself heterodox, and Eliot seems to have derived it largely from the writings of T.E.Hulme.48 Besides, in some of the central concerns and presuppositions in his early phase Hulme exercised an influence on him. He is mentioned with respect in "The Function of Criticism" (the poems of T.E.Hulme only needed to be read alone to have immediate effect p. 75) and "The use of poetry and the use of Criticism" (.... aptitude for theology p. 92). But this is outside the purview of the present work.

Adrian Cunningham in his essay, "Continuity and Coherence in Eliot's Religious Thought" gives the same impression of Hulme's influence on T.S.Eliot. "The one vital area where tensions in Eliot's thought were confronted and forced by Hulme is that of religion, ... Hulme's anti-Romanticism goes beyond Babbitt's for it is also an uncompromising anti-humanism. The duality of human nature in
Babbitt and the irreducible nature of the gaps in experience in Bradley are totally inadequate to Hulme's insistence on the discontinuity of levels in man-evidenced in the well-known statement on original sin cited by Eliot (Second Thoughts about Humanism). Hulme's classicism demands at its centre the assent to some form of transcendental certainty of ethical validation; it is this assent which I think plays a part in Eliot's realisation of the inadequacy of previous systems of resolution and raises the question of religious belief."49

Karl Mannheim is an important person who had close association with T.S. Eliot. Dr. Mannheim was born in Budapest where German cultural influences were predominant. Mannheim spent his receptive years of his life in Hungary and Germany. During his sojourn there a social wave of intellectual development along with the first world war was haunting both the countries. During the period there were many contradictory or heterogeneous currents of new
thought. Mannheim's "Sociology of knowledge" was a manifestation of cross-currents of this period. Unlike Eliot, Mannheim stressed the necessity of a deep-rooted political action to save the prevailing religious chaos. Later, when he began to settle down in London and became a member of the "Moot", he enriched his sociological theory of knowledge which stresses the need of plural elites for continuity and order of society. Eliot's long interaction with Mannheim through the Moot has something to sharpen his concept of elites but a marked difference which I will discuss later on, remains between them.

Eliot's ideas on 'elites' have some resemblance to Dr. Karl Mannheim's doctrine of 'elites' and culture. Dr. Mannheim held the view that social conflict is caused by the diversity of individual ways of thought and personal criteria of truth. He believed that these differences in thought and criteria of truth are more basic than economic disparity and class consciousness, In 'Man and society' and
"Ideology and Utopia: "An introduction to sociology of knowledge" (1936) Dr. Mannheim holds the same view. In 'Notes Towards the Definition of Culture' Eliot examines Mannheim's views of culture and 'elites' to illustrate resemblance to and differences of his own views of culture and elites. According to Dr. Mannheim, the 'intelligentsia' i.e. the 'elite' is the culture-creating group of society. And he thinks that there are many types of elites: the political, the organising, the intellectual, the artistic, the moral and the religious. And each of them contribute to the development of Culture of Society. According to Mannheim in different ages the elites are selected on the basis of 'blood, property and achievement'. "Aristocratic society ....... chose its elites primarily on blood principle. Bourgeois society gradually introduced, as a supplement, the principle of wealth, a principle which also obtained for the intellectual elite, inasmuch as education was more or less available only to the offspring of
the well-to-do. It is of course, true that the principle of achievement was combined with the two other principles in earlier periods, but it is the important contribution of modern democracy as long as it is rigorous, that the achievement principle increasingly tends to become the criterion of social success.50

Eliot agrees with Mannheim's historical analysis of the three principles of elites but he maintains some differences of opinion as far as the function and culture of the elites are concerned. (i) According to Eliot culture is the creation of the whole society and in the organic structure of society Mannheim's 'elites' will bring about further development in a kind of cycle, each class nourishing the others. (ii) Eliot thinks that Dr. Mannheim's compartmentalisation of elites may isolate one type of elite from the other and Eliot feels, there should be a common accord for circulation of ideas among this enlightened
section of people but Mr. Mannheim is silent about it.

(iii) Eliot says that Mannheim confuses elite with class because Eliot thinks that the dominant section of society and the elite are not the same. Whereas Mannheim depart­mentalises culture along with the 'elite' Eliot wishes that whole of the population of a society should take an active part in cultural activities — not in the same activities or on the same level.

As far as the transmission of culture is concerned Eliot's primary channel of transmission of culture is not the culture creating elites but the family. It is very difficult to say how far Eliot had affiliation to Mannheim's sociological and philosophical ideas but he might certainly have had some inspiration from his acquaintance with Mannheim's views.

While in London Karl Mannheim became a member of a group of intellectuals and literary persons called the
"Moot" of which Eliot also became a member. During April 1938 and July 1948 Mannheim attended eighteen meetings of the Moot, and Eliot eleven. In one of the Moot meetings of 1943, Mannheim presented a paper called "Towards a New social philosophy: A Challenge to Christian Thinkers by a Sociologist." In this paper Mannheim argued that the movement, Laissez Faire, has exhausted its possibilities and the free play of forces in the economy had lost its power of balance. Man's increasing capacity for individual judgment is generating the possibility of a process which may create a danger of totalitarianism. Mannheim thought that society could not be changed by a revolution alone; it could be changed only by persuading and uniting the intelligentsia and those in power and responsibility: "We want to mobilise the intelligent people of good will in this country who are waiting for a lead. At the same time there must be a popular movement to back what the elites are doing. You cannot build a great movement without the dynamism of the social leadership."
Mannheim's theory of elites attracted Eliot but his insistence on political action was repugnant to Eliot. He did not believe that the political actions of the politicians representing the social elites would be able to maintain the continuity and coherence of society. For Eliot believes that the condition of highly industrialised modern society, in a machine age the conservation and development of the sense of values will be very difficult without the sanction of religious faith. But Mannheim shows in his "Sociology of knowledge" that the direction of society may be determined not by any super-natural power but by objects latent in the structure of society: his theory of historicism implies that Mannheim is strongly identified himself with historicism—this became one of the essential ingredients of the sociology of knowledge. But in his hands, historicism became subtly transformed; for as we shall see, he came more to stress the element of commitment, of action as
the real substance of the historic process. For him the basic impulse towards historicism was not the need to save some possibility of communion with the Absolute, if only after-glow of a defunct religious tradition — although some such yearning may have been present — but rather the need to endow a progressive political creed with depth, to save it from dogmatic shallowness."52

Besides, Mannheim's position regarding the 'utopia' of knowledge of mankind is not anti-Marxist. He neither rejects the industrial development nor believes in the proletarian culture but he combines some of the Marxist elements, necessary for direction of society, but T.S. Eliot is against the industrial 'Progress' of society and he detests the secular and mechanical advancement of society.

Mannheim's influence on the contemporary writers, particularly the members of the 'Moot' had far reaching effect in matters of political, economic
and democratic planning.

After Mannheim's death in 1947, T.S. Eliot writes in the Times, "... the remarkable influence which Mannheim had come to exercise, within the short period of his residence in this country, upon men of his own generation, not all engaged in the same studies, who had the benefit of his acquaintance. His interests were so wide as to touch those men practising a variety of intellectual activities; personal charm, and his kindly interest in human beings drew such association closer. His talk was always a stimulant to original thought." 53

The above discussion on the affiliation, association and influence of Charles Maurras, Jacques Maritain, T.E. Hulme, Irving Rabbitt, Ezra Pound, Karl Mannheim and many others on the critical milieu of T.S. Eliot shows all the writers and philosophers mentioned above advocate a social order marked by stability, discipline, rule by a superior elite and
control of individual impulses. While the anti-romantic tendency of Irving Babbitt and Charles Maurras might have influenced Eliot, his yearning for social order based on Christian religion might have been strengthened by Maritain. His belief in monarchical political philosophy is definitely the result of his acquaintances with Charles Maurras, Ezra Pound, T.E.Hulme and Karl Mannheim contributed a lot to his mental make-up.

Thus all of these writers, at different stages answer some of the deeper yearnings and needs of Eliot's mind. Eliot seems to belong to this particular camp in social and political theory. If he shows greater moderation in his views it does not mean that he has less loyalty to the principles held by them.
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CHAPTER III

T.S. Eliot's Ideas on Education

Education is the greatest vehicle for reproduction of culture. To that extent any notion of culture of society implies a certain system of education. We find Eliot also devoting himself to the task of propounding a theory of education, corresponding to his general theory of culture. While it is important to consider the distinctiveness of his views on education one must also indicate its utopian aspects.

T.S. Eliot's idea of education is derived from the philosophy of Christian life necessary, according to him, for the direction of a Christian society. His idea of education was propounded in opposition to the contemporary political and educational system of society which, according to him, emphasises the acquisition of information, technical
competence and superficial culture. The system of education advocated by Eliot is a religious system of education with distinctive criteria and values. T.S. Eliot thinks that an educational system of a nation is much more important than the system of government of the nation; because, according to Eliot "only a proper system of education can unify the active and the contemplative life, action and speculation, politics and the arts."

It is important to mention in this connection that T.S. Eliot found that the liberal democratic form of government is either anti-religious or non-religious. Hence he did not consider them proper patrons of education which in his view subserves religious ends.

He distrusts the secular view of education. According to the liberal democratic idea education is a state subject and therefore it is bound up with the short term interest of the state. But Eliot's idea of education is to develop the basic human qualities, the
natural virtues and transmit 'Culture' from one generation to another. And therefore he tries to rise above the narrow short-term political and mechanical interest of the state.

In this chapter I propose to discuss E.S. Eliot's ideas of education with reference to his writings on the subject and particular emphasis is laid on the early years of his life.

It is imperative to discuss Eliot's early formative years because E.S. Eliot's early background has definitely something to contribute to the formation of his ideas on education. Eliot was born in a family that had a long tradition of religious and academic involvement with a distinguished record of social work. He was born in 1888, in St. Louis, Missouri and was educated in Smith Academy, where he was taught, "Latin and Greek, together with Greek and Roman history, English and American history, elementary mathematics, French and German. "He was brought up, he says in an address, 'American Literature and the
Americal Language', delivered in the Washington University on June 9th, 1953, among three things — the Unitarian Church of the Messiah, the city of St. Louis and the Washington University; and "these are the symbols of religion, the community of education: I think very good beginning for any child, to be brought up to reverence such institutions, and to be taught that personal and selfish aims should be subordinated to the general good which they represent." Thus we find his own testimony that Eliot had been from the beginning biased in favour of a Social rather than individualistic view of education where reverence has an important part.

The influence of his mother had far-reaching impact on his poetic mind and it might have also helped him to form his religious philosophy for maintenance of discipline and order in social life.

The issue of education finds expression in "The Idea of a Christian Society" (1939), "Notes Towards
the Definition of Culture" (1943) and "The Aims of Education" (1950) and in some other scattered essays and pamphlets. Valerie Eliot informs us, in the introduction "To Criticise the Critic and other Writings" that T.S. Eliot had the intention of expanding his "Aims of Education" into a book but it never happened. But his published writings are enough to give a comprehensive idea of the educational system he proposed for English society.

In "The Idea of a Christian Society" T.S. Eliot's main contention was that educational ideals were under pressure to adapt to political ideals directed to reconstruction of society. According to him political theory may have some relationship to educational theory, but the educational system must not be entirely subordinated to the political organisation.

In his ideal Christian society Eliot gives more importance to the system of education based on Christian
philosophy of life than to a political system of governance. T.S. Eliot believes in the organic theory of evolution of society. According to him a society is like a self-developing organism, and therefore the unity of structure of society is organic and any change in the structure of society must come from within it by way of development only. A society is not a composition of some physical structures like the ones envisaged by the communists and the socialists. This is why Eliot laid emphasis on the natural growth of society and rejected theories of social reconstruction. The system of society advocated by Eliot has to grow up to the necessity of values and criteria for maintenance of virtues and well-being among the people. And education, he thinks, unlike the communists should help grow up the ethical qualities latent in man and again he thinks that education should not be merely a vehicle for construction of man as parts of a 'mechanical' — man is not an assemblage of human parts only. It is something beyond it and likewise a society is not a group of people assembled together for common interests.
only, but there is something beyond it.

In a Christian society, Eliot thinks education must be religious. Before going on to the issue of religion in education, it is pertinent to discuss the contemporary political situation, particularly the post-second world war situation, which led Eliot to react against the political and educational system in England.

A new awareness about education and more particularly about human civilisation seems to have emerged after the second world War. Most of the nations throughout the world began to contemplate some new directions towards the social changes during the fifties. Great Britain also did not remain apart from the growing social tendencies to propose a reconstruction of British society. When Clement Atlee took over as Prime-Minister of Great Britain, he emphasised the nationalisation of some industries, especially coal, electricity etc. A further major area in which there was much activity was
education. A new Education Act was passed on April 1, 1945. It provided for reforms in the British public system of education and regular governmental inspection of all private schools. After 1947 all children were required to attend school until they were fifteen years old. Facilities, technical training and vocational education for adults were greatly enlarged.

These reforms did not receive support from conservative people like T.S. Eliot. But the British way of thinking was revolutionised by these new changes. As has already been said, T.S. Eliot wanted to see his ideals of an educational system expressed in terms of cultural and religious ideals.

In an essay called "Modern Education and the Classics" (1932) Eliot criticises the then system of education which is "becoming chaotic and meaningless" in view of some ultimate questions: 'Questions of education are frequently discussed as if they bore no relation to the social system.
in which and for which the education is carried on.
This is one of the commonest reasons for the unsatisfactory-ness of the answers. It is only within a
particular social system that a system of education
has any meaning. If education today seems to become
more and more chaotic and meaningless, it is primarily
because we have no settled and satisfactory arrangement
of society, and because we have both vague and diverse
opinions about the kind of society we want. Education
is a subject which cannot be discussed in a void: Our
questions raise other questions, social, economic,
financial, political. And the bearings are on more
ultimate problems even than these: to know what we want
in education we must know what we want in general we
must derive our theory of education from our philosophy
of life. The problem turns out to be a religious problem. 3

Eliot, therefore detested the utilitarian aim
of education. He says: "The individual wants more education
not as an aid to the acquisition of wisdom but in order to get on; the nation wants more in order to get better of other classes, or at least to hold its own against them. Education is associated therefore with technical efficiency on the one hand, and with rising in society on the other.\textsuperscript{4}

In another essay "The Classics and the Man of Letters" (1942) Eliot put forward some solutions to the chaotic and meaningless and deteriorating problems of contemporary education. The prime objective of his idealistic solutions regarding the contemporary education is the promotion of a culturally healthy society and with it also is interwined Eliot's philosophy of life.

"The problem of the survival of the English literature, therefore, brings us to the problem of the need for unity in education, the need for some unification which will not be to the detriment of any of the branches of learning and investigations, scientific and humanistic. This
problem, so much greater than any problem of any administration, organisation, or curricular devices, because it is a spiritual problem, because its solution involves not merely planning, but growing a pattern of values, is so vast a problem that it is not for the educational specialist alone, but for all who are concerned with the structure of society.5

At the root of the 'structure of society'— as it means all the structural elements as an organisation, lies the unity of culture and education can play a prominent role for promotion of this unity, which, according to Eliot "can grow on the old roots: the Christian faith, and the Classical Languages European inherit in common."6 The educational system of Great Britain should aim at the transmission of culture and not only the literature but the teachers must be aware of rich Greek and Latin tradition of Europe. And at the same time one should be aware that
"an educational system cannot of itself bring about either great faith or great literature: it is true to say that our education is not so much the generator of our culture as the off-spring of it. But those who care for the preservation, the extension and the advancement of culture cannot fail to interest themselves, however unqualified they may be to pass judgment, in our classical heritage."  

Eliot's Chicago series of lectures (1950) on education can be best described as his ideas about an educational system in favour of perpetuation of cultural and religious values in society and it also sums up his reactions against the contemporary educational chaos.

Eliot discusses the confronting problems of education in a methodical way more relevant and wide than his earlier discussion in 'Notes Towards the Definition of Culture.'

Eliot takes C.F.W.Joad's three aims of education for elaborate discussion because these aims suggest some of
his own ideas to some extent:

1. To enable a boy or girl to make his/her living.
2. To equip him/her to play his/her part as a citizen of democracy.
3. To enable him/her to develop all the latent powers and faculties of his nature and so enjoy a good life.

The first aim of education i.e. the professional aim is a permanent part of education and no educational system can ignore it. But it can only be interpreted in connection with the second, (the social) and the third one (the individual aspect of education.) The three aims of education taken together imply a good society, because only in a good society an individual while earning his livelihood may fit in with the needs and requirements of society and develop individual powers and capacities latent in him.
Joad says that in a 'democratic' society the three aims of education, under discussion can be achieved but Eliot does not approve of such a form of society. His points of disagreement are: 1) the word 'democracy' does not signify a particular form of society, for the idea of a democratic society is itself variable: in each democratic country has to fashion a democracy which will differ in some respects from those of others; 2) and democracy lacks a sound accord between the formal institutions and the ethos of particular people that operates them.

"Education of the young to play their part in a democracy is a necessary adaptation of individual to environment, if a democracy is what he is going to play his part in: if not, it is making the pupil instrumental to the accomplishment of a social change which the educator has at heart — and this
is not education but something else.  

T.S. Eliot maintains that the purposes of education cannot be taken as simple because it raises more questions than answers. C.F.H.Joad's definition of education has strong limitations and dangers. The chief danger, according to T.S. Eliot is that in a democratic system of society education may come to be interpreted as educational 'adaptation to environment': For realisation of the 'individual's latent powers and faculties of nature' and for earning a livelihood, the individual will have to work within the bounds of a particular society and he will have to adapt himself to society; but complete adaptation to a particular form of society will make him completely incapable of any change or development of his own powers and faculties. If completely identified a particular form of society may enslave the individuals to suit the design of society only and under such condition the individuals will lose all his powers of discovery and innovation.
At the beginning of the chapter entitled "Notes on Education and Culture and conclusion" Flot informs us that, according to *Oxford Dictionary*, Education means (1) the process of bringing up: (2) the systematic instruction, schooling or training given to the young in preparation for the works of life. (3) culture or development of powers, formation of character.

Another definition regarding the purpose of education is taken from the *Oxford Conference on Church, Community and State* (1937). Flot quotes: "Education is the process by which the community seeks to open it to all the individuals within it and enable them to take their part in it. It attempts to pass on to them its culture, including the standards by which it would have them live. Where that culture is regarded as final, the attempt is made to impose it on younger minds."
From the above definitions Eliot deduces that education has a (I) vocational as well as (II) a cultural and a (III) political role to play. Eliot tries to free education from mere political and vocational aims and emphasises the cultural role it can play, but at the same time he is opposed to "limit education (is apt) to connote merely a salary or a pension whereas cultural education cannot an "education for leisure."  

T.S. Eliot, on the contrary, maintains that,  
"education must be a process of adaptation to our society as it is; partly a preparation for the sort of society we want it to become." The definition of education covers more than these areas of activities. But Eliot thinks that "every definition of the purpose of education, implies some concealed, or rather implicit philosophy or theology."
As far as the question of citizenship is concerned Eliot agrees with Joad's aims of education but his chief cause of difference of opinion is that Joad omits any mention of training in moral behaviour and feeling. Eliot thinks that a child should be educated to be a 'good man' rather than a 'good citizen'. According to Eliot the idea of good citizenship may narrow down the concept of education to a short-term design.

But Eliot is aware of the fact that education has a social purpose. (As has already been hinted above) the social purposes of education should not be directed to serve the political aim of a society because it may consist of the influence of the dominant class of society. The possibility is that in a political society the purposes of education may be deliberately limited to some political aims of the state. According to Eliot we should be aware
that the system of education in every country is the product of history. In so far as the system of education is shaped by the conscious aim of a few men — there is always grave danger of borrowing or imposing something which does not fit the ethos, the way of life, the habits of thought and feeling of a people.

Though education has a social purpose yet the privacy of the individuals should not be allowed to be taken away in the name of society. He thinks that the authority of control should not be absolutely with the state because a society organised and based on the principles of development of society may further the reduction of men to machines. A socialist society will not respect the individual liberty and freedom necessary for the expression of the 'latent power and faculties' in him. According to him a man is not merely a citizen of a particular society. He is more than a social animal and therefore there should be limitation to the social control on him.
He should not be viewed as parts of a machinery. Rather he should be considered as the life force of society.

The fear of state interference in matters of education was necessitated because of consequences of the socialist system of education particularly in the U.S.S.R. The general fear in Europe was that the whole of the educational system in socialist countries was under the control of the state and people had no right of freedom. State as the sovereign power decided everything on behalf of people and compelled every citizen to do what the state liked. Eliot reacted against such a political system and held the opinion that complete subordination of the educational system to the state would be repulsive to human development and it would jeopardise the creative and innovative power of man. Such a system would help create a fossilised society. But Eliot believes in a creative educational system that may contribute to creative aspect of society and creative man:
"There is also the danger that education—which indeed comes under the influence of politics—will take upon itself the reformation and direction of culture, instead of keeping its place as one of the activities through which a culture realises itself."

This is one of the main reasons why T.S.Eliot emphasises the necessity of training 'good man' rather than 'good citizen'.

These views make it clear that Eliot's alternative to liberal culture is not an authoritarian culture directed by a state. While his idea of culture subordinates individuals it does not set up above him a system of domination. The Christian authority of his ideals is designed to help realise his powers rather than merely control him.

The issue of training people into 'good man' points to the relation of education to religion. The
improvement of "man as man" through educational training relates to the authority of control on man and society.

As Eliot was antagonistic to the increasing authority of political control, he turned to the authority of religion and automatically he leads us to the questions of (i) the place of religion in education and the (ii) place of education in religion. In answer to the first question, the place of religion in education Eliot takes the following to be the prominent responses:

1. The state would possess a particular religion or religious denomination and this religion should be taught in the state controlled educational institutions without, of course interfering with the private institutions.

2. The complete separation of religious instruction from instructions in other subjects. No religious beliefs will be taken for granted or inculcated in schools or colleges.
3. The imparting in schools of religious instruction representing the common belief of the greatest part of the local society, leaving the doctrines of any particular denomination to be taught by the parents and their Church. This is more or less the intention of the Education Act, 1944.

4. A mixed system in which no religion is taught in the state schools but in which the adherents of any religion may set up denominational schools for their own children.

According to T.S. Eliot, all the solutions given above are unsatisfactory. The first two systems are based on principle and the third and the fourth on expediency. The first system of religious education is not possible in England because English society is not a homogeneous society and state schools or colleges with a particular
religion is possible only in a society homogenous in religion; or else a dictatorial government will be necessary to impose its own doctrine on the vast majority of society. In one case it may lead to the control of the Church by the state or in another the control of the state by the Church. Both the situations according to T.S. Eliot will be chaotic.

As far as the problems of educational control are concerned T.S. Eliot's major point is that the authority to control the aim of education should be above or outside the authority of the State, and the individual should submit himself or his duties and responsibilities to this authority of control. Only then Eliot thinks, the development of "man as man" and "latent powers and faculties" of individual can be left to either the individual or to the educator for interpretation. It is the duty of the religious teachers to instruct the individuals as to what is right and what is wrong, what is
wisdom and what is folly, and to give definite meaning to the improvement of "Man as man": "We need a Church capable at times of conflict with the State as well as of cooperation. We need a Church to protect us from the state, and to define the limits of our rights, responsibilities and duties of submission in relation to our rights and to our responsibilities and duties to ourselves and towards God. And owing to human fallibility, we may sometimes need the state to protect us against the Church. Too close an identification of the two can lead to the oppression from which there is no escape." 16

T.S. Eliot thinks that any theory of education as has already been said, is connected with the theory of religious philosophy, political theory and theology. He does not rule out a unity between educational theory and political and religious theory but he does believe
that educational theory must derive its sanctions not from political theory but from religious philosophy like the conservatives in England. T.S. Eliot also believes that education has a traditional religious role to play in the formation of culture of society and individual, but at the same time he is aware that the creative power of the individuals, which he emphasises in the interests of a "world-view" is not lost under the pressure of the Church. According to Eliot, the vital issue is not the place of religion in education but the place of education in religion. Eliot thinks that in any future Christian society, the educational system will be formed according to Christian pre-supposition of what education is for.

The anti-democratic bias of Eliot comes out most prominently in his advocacy of an elite to guide society. In Eliot's scheme of things the people who will play the role of educators or intellectuals will be a
collection of different persons with exceptional ability. This group of intellectuals or educators are what Eliot calls the "Community of Christians." The Community of Christians will be consciously and thoughtfully carrying out their duties with their intellectual and spiritual superiority. Eliot's idea of "Community of Christians" has some resemblance to what Coleridge has called 'the clerisy.' The content of Coleridge's clerisy is (i) the universities and great schools of learning (ii) the parochial pastorate, (iii) and the local school masters.

And these three categories of people carry out the intellectual and clerical function of society. But Eliot's meaning of the 'Community of Christians' is different.

Eliot does not include the whole of the teaching body in his community of Christians. The community of Christians as envisaged by Eliot will contain both clerisy and laity of superior intellectual and spiritual gift. There may be persons professing other faith than Christianity. But
in "a Christian society education must be religious, not in the sense that it will be administered by eclesiastics, still less in the sense that it will exercise pressure, or attempt to instruct everyone in theology, but in the sense that its aims will be directed by a Christian philosophy of life." 17

As far as the idea of education is concerned the community of Christians, "composed of both clergy and laity of more conscious, more intellectually and spiritually developed" 18 will import education and will serve as the conscious mind and the conscience of the nation.

T.S. Eliot thinks that the educational system is not an organised system calculated to plan the development or reconstruction of society. And therefore time and again Eliot emphasises that the purposes of education should not be limited to some parochial end of
society. As we know, Eliot believes in the theory of growth of society therefore education, he thinks, has a relation to religion in the sense that every traditional society cannot progress without religion, and according to him religion being the guiding force of society, education can help the society grow up from within. Education cannot bring about changes in culture or society or it should not be allowed to do so — education should help grow up the means favourable to culture.

Like the Brahmins in ancient India, Eliot's community of Christians are the chief custodians of tradition and wisdom. They are allowed to play their role as the conscience of the nation. Like the Brahmins, they are intellectually and spiritually developed enough to guide society in a proper direction. But unlike the Brahmins, the community of Christians are not hereditary, they are constituted with persons with exceptional
ability from different strata of society. These people will define the powers and faculties of man and formulate the purposes of education, necessary for maintenance of order and discipline in society.

At this stage of discussion it seems that Eliot is more stimulative when he expresses his doubts that in a liberal democratic state the educational system may be under the control of some groups which can serve narrow, short-term political interests of the state. He therefore pleads for the control of institutions which will rise above the narrow, short-term interest of politics. Because a liberal democratic state cannot take into account certain vital questions regarding human life, the education sponsored by it can dispense informations, impart technical competence, but it is rather unhappy in the area of questions regarding the ultimate ends of life. Hence Eliot's objection to conventional modern education can stimulate our critical thinking on contemporary
education and inspire us to look for sounder systems.

At the same time it will be difficult to agree with Eliot that his solutions to the questions will serve our purposes well. Apart from the dogmatic acceptances of Christianity it is impossible that the Church will always remain above narrow political aims. Rather in the name of carrying forward higher values the Church itself may at times suppress certain human powers and faculties which are not less important than religion. For example, after the counter-Reformation the Catholic Church in Europe took the lead in strangling all critical and scientific thought. While it is true that liberal democratic temper is indifferent to certain higher spiritual needs of man, for example, the need for community, it by no means follows that a religious institution can always rise above the arrogant, power-lusts. As far as the definition of education and its purposes are concerned Eliot is typical of his age.
"What education for" and "What are the purposes of education" are two important questions that need answers. Eliot thinks that the purposes of education should be directed more for acquiring wisdom and "Human wisdom, according to Eliot, cannot be separated from divine wisdom without tending to become merely worldly wisdom, as vain as folly itself." According to him the great repository of wisdom is the Catholic Church with its inheritance from Israel and Greece. Eliot's conception of wisdom is that it cannot be acquired in the educational institutions, because the method and ideas coming into vogue in modern education, scientific specialisation on the one hand, and the treatment of humanities either as a kind of pseudo-science or as superficial culture, are not calculated to cultivate a disposition towards wisdom; something which certainly, educational institutions cannot because it cannot be learnt in the time or wholly in such sour-
roundings, but which they can teach us to desire, which
they can teach us how to go about acquiring.20

By wisdom Eliot does not mean the narrow
conception of "Science" that is limited to technical
and material aspects only: "I wish that the classical
conception of wisdom might be restored, so
that we might not be left wholly to the
political scientist on the one hand, or the
demagogues on the other. For the ordinary
politician, wisdom is identified with expediency, for political scientist it disappears
in theory......"21

It is true that the purposes of education must
not be solely confined to a vocational goal of life. Its
purposes must not be limited to technical competence and
mechanical efficiency for earning a livelihood. As the
contrary Eliot in the first place, emphasised the role
of education for acquiring wisdom and knowledge rather
than information and professional knowledge. But the modern industrial society is a consumptional organisation which is largely dependent upon capital, labour technology and efficiency. To earn a livelihood in such a society one must adjust to the existing situation and therefore a system of education must equip the youngsters with the necessary professional knowledge. And there is no doubt the modern educational system has become itself a big industry — diversified according to the need of society. Formal institutional education has become an indispensable part of the system and it is of great importance for continuity of social interests. Though Eliot did not omit the role of vocational education yet he did not insist on this aspect of education adequately. He considered the commercial or professional aspect of education to be of less importance for his scheme of "cultural-education." Admittingly under the present circumstances his ideas on education, particularly the vocational aims are less
convincing. And in the second place, according to Eliot, education has a cultural purpose and obviously he pays more attention to this aspect of education. Significantly, Eliot says that education should help transmit culture but at the same time he says that culture is not consciously transmittable. Corresponding to the role of educators, teachers or broadly speaking the Community of Christians, as advocated by Eliot, the cultural role of education is not confined to the material aspect of things. The teachers must teach 'divine wisdom'. But actually culture is not a product of an enlightened few, it is the product of the great majority of people. But Eliot confines the cultural role of education to the elite.

It is commonly agreed that every system of education should emphasise the moral development of citizens for making them 'good men' and Eliot deserves appreciation for his insistence on promotion of the cultural, moral and religious values of society. But the method of
attaining cultural standard through Church which is, according to him the repository of great wisdom and his belief in hierarchy and class society make his ideas on education far from convincing. For a uniform moral code of behaviour and promotion of culture, Christianity is no longer a living religion in Great Britain itself. There is no alternative to democratic and free education and recognisably the unity of every society is engineered through and by political pattern. To that extent Fliot’s social thinking on education seems idealistic, but in so far as it underlines the inadequacies of contemporary education, especially its cultural weaknesses, his views are a welcome stimulus to thought.
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